

EVALUATIVE POTENTIAL OF THE COMPONENT COMPOSITION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS OF THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE REGARDING INDICATION OF THE WORLD OF EMOTIONS

^aNADIA BOYKO, ^bLIUDMYLA KOTKOVA, ^cSVITLANA LYTVYNSKA, ^dOKSANA PRYKHODKO, ^eVIKTORIA SAMBORYN

^a*Nizhyn State University named after Mikola Gogol, 2, m, Grafka Str., 16611, Nizhyn, Ukraine*

^b*Chernihiv Regional Institute of Postgraduate Pedagogical Education named after K. D. Ushinsky, 83, Slobidska Str., 14021, Chernihiv, Ukraine*

^c*National Aviation University, 1, Lubomyra Huzara Ave., Kyiv, 03058, Kyiv, Ukraine*

email: ^abni_bni52@ukr.net, ^bkotkoval@ukr.net, ^czlys@ukr.net, ^doksana.prykhodko@npp.nau.edu.ua, ^enika00007@ukr.net

Abstract: The relevance of the undertaken research is determined by the following need: 1) to identify the features of a complex system of interactions and interdependence of the concepts of "evaluation", "evaluation", "values"; 2) to study the category of evaluation at the phraseological level, 3) to isolate evaluativeness from related and close, but not identical linguistic phenomena, 4) to solve the problem of the correlation and interaction of semantics and pragmatics in the study of evaluated values. The article sets an actual scientific task, which consists in studying the specifics of evaluativeness as a component of the meaning of phraseological units in the Ukrainian language on the basis of phraseological units denoting the behavior and emotional world of a person, such as euphemisms and dysphemisms. The study revealed that the dominant formants, representing spiritual and psychological values, the emotional world of Ukrainians is a component of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language for designation of emotional states and reactions.

Keywords: evaluativeness; emotion; phraseological units; euphemism; dysphemism.

1 Introduction

In modern linguistics, there is an increased interest in the problems of "language and personality", "lexical and phraseological systems and objectification of emotional reactions and human states in the ethnically oriented linguistic picture of the world", etc. [2; 5; 9, 17]. The mentioned problems are directly related to the category of evaluation, qualified as a multifaceted phenomenon, studied in different directions and at different linguistic levels: lexical, semantic, grammatical, communicative, stylistic, etc. This category belongs to the most researched and debated for a long time. The nature, model, basis, language means of expressing the category of evaluability found their explanation in the works of Ukrainian and other linguists - V. Ilyin, S. Yermolenko, V. Kalashnyk, I. Kononenko, V. Chabanenko, I. Hrytsyutenko, M. Kochergan, A. Moisienko, O. Selivanova, L. Pustovit, N. Sologub, L. Stavyska, T. Kosmedy; V. von Humboldt, K. Fossler, H. Claus, A. Vezhbytska, O. Wolf, V. Kharchenko, V. Shakhovsky, and others.

The essence of the evaluativeness category is multidimensional. The term "evaluability category" is not recorded in linguistic (interpretive) and encyclopedic dictionaries, but it is actively used in dissertations, monographs, and articles. The category of evaluability is explained by axiological semantic plans of lexical and phraseological units. Axiological semantics is determined by the evaluation, which serves as the semantic base for the formation of evaluative values. Evaluation is rightly qualified as a component (constituent) of the connotative macro-component of the semantic structure of a language unit, which conveys the attitude of native speakers to the signified [5, p. 28], it is determined by the "absolute scale of "good - neutral (indifferent) - "bad" and the relative scale of "better - equally neutral - equally bad" [12, p. 525].

Evaluation is actively researched as a text category subordinated to adjacent text representatives - informativeness and modality. The latter objectifies the attitude of the addresser (the author of the text), his position in the text, the views of the actors, the "presumable real or hypothetical reader simulated by the author's consciousness", his attitude to the described facts, events, phenomena, persons, their behavior on the "absolute scale" "good - neutral (indifferent) - bad" and the relative scale "better

- equally neutral - equally bad - worse" [12, p. 525]. The characteristic of evaluation as a textual category presupposes the presence of other varieties of axiological modality, their functions. O. Selivanova proposed the definition of evaluation as a type of "modality of expression that reflects the axiological plan of the situation indicated by the message, that is, the value orientation of the speaker in relation to the integrated event" [12, p. 525-526].

Evaluativeness is defined as a categorical feature, first of all, of artistic style, modern journalism, the language of mass communication, etc. Namely in these areas, the addresser's axiological accents, verbalized by lexical and phraseological units, other linguistic means of expressing evaluative semantic plans, are especially noticeable. Both individual and thematic groups of lexemes and phrases that have undergone the processes of modification, reinterpretation, shift in their semantic structures in the process of communicative acts appear as representatives of evaluability.

Modern linguistics is focused on the active study of the connections between national languages and the emotional sphere of a person. The attention of linguists is drawn to the relationship between language and psychology, language and mental activity, language and culture, language and society. Theoretical studies in the field of the linguistics of emotions contain investigations carried out on the actual material of many languages: Ukrainian (S. Yermolenko, O. Selivanova, Yu. Pradid, G. Demydenko, etc.), German (V. Gamzyuk, etc.), English (O. Kunin, T. Tonenchuk, etc.), French (N. Lugova, etc.).

Ukrainian linguists actively work on the problems of identifying means and ways of categorizing emotional reactions and states of a person, his inner potential, ethnically marked axiological manifestations of the environment of the national world picture and carry out implementation of various aspects' directions of scientific research on the material of Slavic and non-Slavic languages. Among them, there are linguistic and cultural aspect of the study of emotions (S. Yermolenko, V. Zhaivoronok, Zh. Kolois, I. Golubovska, M. Bagan, etc.), semantic (O. Taranenko, T. Kosmeda, O. Borisov, N. Boyko, L. Kotkova, etc.), psycholinguistic (V. Zhaivoronok, O. Selivanova, T. Kosmeda, etc.), functional (N. Guivanyuk, O. Taranenko, V. Kalashnyk, A. Moisienko, V. Chabanenko, T. Khomich, etc.). The expressive and pictorial potential of idioms as verbalizers of emotional reactions and human states, a number of nationally marked axiological opposites of the phrase (Y. Pradid, M. Gamzyuk, G. Demydenko, etc.), the tropeic system as a representative of emotional semantic plans (V. Kalashnyk, A. Moisienko, O. Taranenko, L. Kravets, etc.), emotional and sensory semantic components in the structure of lexical and phraseological units (O. Taranenko, N. Boyko, T. Khomich) and others were revealed and traced.

The relevance of the research is related to a new look at the axiological dimensions of the phraseological units of the Ukrainian language for the designation of emotional states and reactions.

The purpose of the article is to reveal the specifics of the evaluative potential of the component composition of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language to indicate the world of emotions.

2 Materials and Methods

In the article, psychologism and functionalism, which dominate modern linguistics, are defined as the main methodological principles and appear as scientific paradigms that objectify the interaction of evaluative dimensions of ethnicity and their phraseological verbalization. The general scientific methodology

is aimed at identifying and analyzing the presence of a person in language, various types of communicative activity of speakers in the aggregate of their views on the world, on fragments of the environment and psychological and axiological reactions, evaluative conclusions, etc. Psychologism and functionalism are based on the leading principles formulated by scientists: 1) "knowledge of a certain people through its language, and knowledge and understanding of a language through knowledge of its creator and bearer - the people" [16, p. 348]; 2) a relevant feature of phraseological units is their national specificity, the presence of evaluative-emotional and value components in their semantic structures, mentally marked information about the spiritual, psychological-emotional experience of a certain ethnic group [15].

In the research process, a complex of methods and techniques was used, the choice of which determined the subject of scientific analysis and formulated tasks. In order to determine the basic concepts of the axiological semantics of phraseological units, a systematic review of linguistic scientific literature devoted to axiological meaning plans of phraseological units, ethnolinguistic analysis of the semantics of phraseological units for the designation of emotional states and reactions, functional manifestations of its implementation was carried out. Key scientific propositions are summarized on the basis of integrative and interdisciplinary approaches to the study of axiological semantics of emotional phraseological units and in the context of phraseological verbalization of emotional states and reactions of a person, the dominance of evaluative characteristics of his emotional activity.

During the analysis, the method of linguistic observation was used - to determine emotional phraseological units, their evaluative semantics and objectification of emotional and axiological semantic plans of phraseological models, for revealing of their registration in phraseographic works, systematization, classification and interpretation as manifestations of the inner world of man. The method of definitional analysis, was used, involving identifying the following: 1) a set of phrases that explain psycho-emotional semantic plans and contain information about emotional reactions and human states in their dictionary interpretation; 2) thematic groups of phraseological units with lexicographically fixed emosemes and axioemes in their semantic structures; 3) the component composition of phrases, represented by lexical units that are included in the structure of phraseology and reveal the ability of explicit or implicit actualization of axiological semantic plans of positively or negatively evaluated manifestations in specific dictionary definitions; also, it involves finding out whether the axiological semes are recorded in the components of direct and figurative meanings of lexemes, whether they find objectification in explanatory dictionaries (in dictionary definitions of lexemes), whether phraseological dictionaries record cases of new contextually modeled evaluative semantic plans of phraseological units, etc.. Descriptive method was applied (to characterize the specifics of motivation and objectification of axiological semantic plans of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language for denoting of emotional states and human reactions), as well as method of component analysis (to identify the features of the semantic structures of phraseological units containing evaluative components (semes) in a dominant position), the method of contextual analysis (to determine the ways of modeling axiological semantic plans of phrases as a result of new combinations and connections of lexemes in the phraseological unit, unexpected combinations of words of different temporal and stylistic ranks within the transformed phraseological unit, etc.), elements of quantitative analysis, etc.

The study is based on factual material taken from the "Phraseological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language", published in 2 books [4]. The source base was supplemented by materials from other phraseological and explanatory dictionaries of the Ukrainian language, as well as the texts of artistic works of Ukrainian writers of different chronological boundaries, in particular, contexts that contain phraseological units to indicate

the emotional states and reactions of characters, transformed phrasemes with expressive formally expressed (explicit) and internal (implicit) axiological semantics, which contribute to the contextual objectification of the connotative components of the semantic structures of phraseological units to denote human emotional states and reactions.

3 Results and Discussion

Expressive (expressive-figurative) and national-cultural aspects of Ukrainian phraseology were the object of research by many Ukrainian linguists, in particular, F. Medvedeva, L. Skrypnyk, N. Babich, V. Uzhchenka, A. Avksentieva, M. Alefirenka, H. Udovichenka, A. Ivchenka, L. Melnyk, V. Vasylenko, and others. However, the evaluation potential of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language to indicate emotional states and reactions was studied fragmentarily, the analysis cannot be considered exhaustive due to the lack of separate fundamental works on this issue, which proves the novelty and highlights the relevance of research.

An indicative feature of the phraseological units of the Ukrainian language for the designation of emotional states and reactions is their national specificity, which is explained by the semantics of evaluative-emotional and value components, that manifest the inner worlds and states of a person in particular and inform about the spiritual-emotional, psychological experience of a certain ethnic group in general.

The basis of the study of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language for the designation of emotional states and reactions is the definition of a phraseological unit as a separately designed, but semantically integral and syntactically indivisible linguistic sign, "which owes its origin and functioning to the phrase-forming interaction of units of the lexical, morphological and syntactic levels" [14, p. 801].

The category of evaluability (axiology) at the lexical and phraseological levels appears as one of the aspects of the interaction between the objective world and the subjective intentions of speakers, that is, the human factor in language. It is traced through evaluative components (elements) in the semantic structure of a phraseological unit, the formation of which involves taking into account both internal capabilities and contextual conditions of functioning. The semantics of phraseological units with an evaluative component reflects the interrelationships of linguistic and non-linguistic factors, it is qualified as a manifestation of the human factor in language and speech. The assessment conveys the socially established or subjectively formed evaluative attitude of speakers to certain extra-linguistic fragments of the conceptual picture of the world and the facts of language and speech.

Building a hierarchy of connotation components, which includes a number of elements, it should be noted that the highest position is occupied by evaluability and emotionality. Under any conditions, the evaluative component must be recognized as primary in relation to the emotional one, since the referent is understood and evaluated first, even before the emotion arises [9, p. 43].

The object being evaluated is compared with others (of the same type), those that do not have a certain evaluation qualification, and is equated to the norm, standard. In this way, compliance or non-compliance with certain stereotyped, standard norms is established and recognized by society as positive or negative. Thus, a calm, balanced pace of speech is traditionally considered the norm, therefore society reacts especially sensitively to any deviations from ethical and cultural norms, fixing and evaluating the abnormality of speech with the help of phraseological units: *мокрим порядом накрити* ("to scold someone") (FSUM, 2, p. 777); *піднімати голос* ("to shout") (FSUM, 2, p. 636); *обкладати словами (як компресами)* ("to scold rudely") (FSUM, 2, p. 568); *правити сухого (смаженого) дуба* ("to talk nonsense") (FSUM, 2, p. 646); *міцне слово* ("rude swearing") (FSUM, 2, p. 828); *перебирати на зубах* ("to spread gossip, to

slander someone”) (FSUM, 2, p. 616); *держати (тримати) язик далеко від розуму* (“to talk nonsense”) (FSUM, 1, p. 230).

The referent can be evaluated by the subject in different ways: from the usual statement of the presence of certain properties, signs, qualities characteristic of him, to a positive/negative attitude. Accordingly, the qualities of the referent are either perceived indifferently, that is, the attitude towards them is qualified as evaluation-neutral, and the evaluation is zero, or they receive approval/disapproval. In this regard, a zero evaluation is allocated on the rating scale (mentally limited, unintelligent; *втягнути (втягнути, простягнути, протягнути, випростати) ноги* (to pull out (extend, straighten) the legs) (FSUM, 2, p. 554); positive (ameliorative) – *проспівана пісенька* (sung song) (FSUM, 2, p. 642); *кирпата сващка* (snub-nosed matchmaker) (FSUM, 2, p. 779); *вічний (віковичний) спокій* (eternal (ever-lasting) peace) (FSUM, 2, p. 841) and negative (derogative, pejorative) – *набитий дурень; відкинути копита (ратиці)* (stuffed fool; throw away hooves). Three types of evaluations represent an evaluative component that is part of the semantic structure of the phraseological meaning of a word and belongs to the mandatory components of connotation [16, p. 72]. Phraseological units that have minimal or zero evaluability provide a background against which evaluatively marked ones are distinguished. While in the lexical system in words with zero evaluability, the concept of norm is not formally expressed, but belongs to the explicit, hidden ones, the phraseological concept of norm is extremely conditional, since senses of evaluativeness and imagery are present and obvious in various proportions. That is why not all axiologically marked phraseological units have neutrally valued counterparts. These mainly include phrases with a derogative value: *брудні руки* – dirty hands (“someone dishonest”) (FSUM, 2, p. 768); long arms “someone encroaches on someone else’s property, can steal it” (FSUM, 2, p. 768), etc.

The evaluation is based on a typical social perception of both the person himself and everything related to his physical, moral, mental, and social essence. Positively (rarely) or negatively (more often) in phraseology, first of all, the person himself is evaluated, much less often – the objects of his activity, management of the household, social relations, etc. Objects and phenomena with which a person is in direct and constant contact and which have a significant meaning for him, move to the periphery. Natural phenomena also affect human actions and plans, but the phraseological system does not actually evaluate them, the lexical system evaluates them only fragmentarily, since, despite a fairly high level of civilization and a certain independence of man from nature, they are traditionally perceived as not subject to intervention and assessment.

All the mentioned concepts are known through comparison, based on the gradation of qualitative features of the referent or the assessment determined by the peculiarities of its perception by the subject of speech. In the latter case, the choice of evaluative value is motivated not by the real properties of the referent, but by the sensory intentions of the speaker. Thus, part of the phraseological units of the semantic group “пити, бути п’яним” (“to drink, to be drunk”) has in its composition a component that is easily associated with the denoted denotation at the synchronic level, for example, *пробка, чарка, пляшка: наступати на пробку (на корок)* (“to get drunk”) (FSUM, 2, p. 536); *заглядати (зазирати) в чарку (пляшку)* (to look into a glass (bottle)) (FSUM, 1, p. 303); *не розминатися з чаркою* (not to warm up with a glass – “to drink much”) (FSUM, 2, p. 754); *вклонятися чарці* (to bow down to a glass – “to drink vodka, get drunk”) (FSUM, 1, p. 135). Linguist V. Zaivoronok characterized the lexeme of *чарка* (a glass) as a sign of ethnoculture: “А чарка [glass] is a vessel for drinking wine and spirits; symbolizes disorder in the family (*Перша чарка – на здоров’я, друга – на веселощі, а третя – для сварки* – “The first drink is for health, the second is for fun, and the third is for a quarrel”, *Господар за чарку, а жінка за сварку* – “The master for a drink, and the woman for a quarrel”); the people condemn the unhealthy craving for *чарка* (a glass) (“Він за чаркою горілки пішов би і на той світ”, “В чарці більше людей

тоне, як у морі”, “Сьорбне чоловік чарку, наче сказиться” (“He would go to the other world for a glass of vodka”, “More people drown in a glass than in the sea”, “A man sips a glass, and it is if he became mad”) [17, p. 635].

The axiological semantics of phraseological units reflects the emotional and psychological experience of the ethnic group, the peculiarities of intellectual mastering of fragments of the national world picture by native speakers, condemnation of negative facts and deviations from certain norms of the corresponding objects of non-linguistic activity. Phraseological units, which appeared as a result of language creation by the people, usually have an established, clearly defined emotional and evaluative meaning, contain information about material life and spiritual values, orientations of ethnos [15].

The evaluative markedness of phraseological units manifests itself not only in the direct axiological meanings of phraseological units, but also in the methods of choosing objects of evaluation, classification and axiological categorization of fragments of reality covered by certain phraseosemantic fields, phraseological groups, synonymous series, antonymic pairs, and contextual mutual influences. The mentioned components form national assessments, value orientations, general parameters of the phraseological picture of the world [15, p. 59].

The negative-evaluative phraseological group “пити, бути п’яним” (to drink, to be drunk) is formed into a synonymous series in which negative connotations are presented dynamically (metaphorically and metonymically). The phraseology *лизнути скляного бога* (“to lick the glass god” – to get drunk, be drunk) (FSUM, 1, p. 423) is based on the “softening” of a negative assessment; phraseology *полоскотати в роті (зуби, горло)* (“to tickle the mouth (teeth, throat)” – to drink a small amount of alcoholic drink) (FSUM, 2, p. 676); *адаміві сльози* (“Adam’s tears” – vodka drinks) (FSUM, 2, p. 831) is based on the use of metonymic images; *ударити в голову* (“hit on the head” – get drunk) (FSUM, 2, p. 911); *хміль бродить у голові* (“someone is drunk, intoxicated”) (FSUM, 2, p. 928); *хміль розібрав* (“someone starts to get drunk”) (FSUM, 2, p. 928); *убити муху (чмеля)* (kill a fly (bumblebee) – “drink wine, vodka”) (FSUM, 2, p. 909); *під мухою* (drunk) (FSUM, 1, p. 515); *під градусом* (“under the degree” – in a state of being drunk) (FSUM, 1, p. 194); *під хмільком* (“under hops” – in a state of minor alcohol intoxication”) (FSUM, 2, p. 928); *під джмелем* (“under a bumblebee” – in a drunken state, drunk) (FSUM, 1, p. 233) are based on the use of metaphorical images. The entire synonymous series has a bitingly ironic flavor, the gradational character of the turns, which reveal a mental attitude towards alcoholism as a great human flaw.

It is important to note that fragments of the conceptual picture of the world with the help of phraseological units are evaluated not by an individual, but primarily by society, in which certain value parameters, criteria, orientations, and guidelines are formed, which the subject of evaluation is guided by, and on which he is as on the basis of various dimensions of relatively generally accepted social norms. Usually, the subject of the evaluation selects phraseological units and uses them either 1) with a mitigating and meliorating purpose (to engage in theft; to steal something – *перевіряти кишені* (“to check pockets”) (FSUM, 2, p. 614); *піднімати (брати), що легко лежить* (“to lift (take) that lies easily”) (FSUM, 2, p. 635); bribery – *слабкість на праву ручку* (“weakness in the right hand”) (FSUM, 2, p. 823); stupid, unreasonable – *з кіндратиком у голові* (“with a kindratic in the head”) (FSUM, 1, p. 375); *в голові горобці цвірінкають* (sparrows are chirping in the head) (FSUM, 1, p. 191); *без царя в голові* – “without a king in the head” (FSUM, 2, p. 939); or 2) with a demeaning and pejorative purpose, emotional expression or strengthening of the figurative macrocomponent: *дубом одубитися* (to die, perish) (FSUM, 2, p. 581); *хай язик відсохне (усохне)* (let the tongue dry (wither)) is used to express great dissatisfaction with someone’s words, conversations (FSUM, 2, p. 976); to (as if) break “is used to express great dissatisfaction, indignation”, negative evaluation (FSUM, 2, p. 750); *що за чортівнина (чортівня)* (this kind of devilry is used

to express dissatisfaction, indignation or surprise about someone, something" (FSUM, 2, p. 956) *тіпун (пипоть, чиряк) вам на язык* "is used to express ill will to someone regarding inappropriate statements", excessive evaluations, etc. (FSUM, 2, p. 885). The proposed examples illustrate the evaluation processes of euphemization and dysphemization known in linguistics.

Euphemization is traced at the lexical (word) level and at the word combination (expression, phraseological unit) level. It is qualified as "a trope used for an indirect, hidden, in particular softened, polite designation of certain objects, phenomena, actions" [14, p. 173-174]. So, we trace the idea of "improving" the evaluative conclusions of the subject, avoiding the direct naming of the referent. There is a replacement of the existing name with another one, that is, a renaming, or the use of a logically and stylistically neutral, "positive" and most motivated primary name. Thus, a euphemism for the phrases *порожня душа, порожнє серце* ("empty soul, empty heart") (someone feels emotional exhaustion, mental desolation, is in a state of depression, indifference to fragments of the surrounding world; because of overwork, grief, etc.) can be as a phraseologism *душа заросла полином* ("soul overgrown with wormwood") (someone became indifferent, lost sensitivity, became insensitive to fragments of the environment), let us compare: *Я тільки з рейду... / Губи, мов крейда, порожня душа* (I'm just from the raid... / Lips, like chalk, an empty soul) (V. Sausyura) and *А коли є гроші – не заросте душа полином. – Чому ж тоді кажуть: і чорт має багато грошей, а в болоті сидить? Дурні плещуть язиками* (And when there is money – the soul will not be overgrown with wormwood. – Then why do they say: the devil has a lot of money, but sits in the swamp? Fools clap their tongues) (E. Gutsalo). The function of euphemistic phraseologisms is determined by the requirements and needs of etiquette, the desire to be polite, to represent a negative emotional state in a somewhat refined expression. Euphemisms usually veil negative actions, manifestations of behavior.

Dysphemization belongs to the opposite processes. Dysphemisms can also be detected both at the lexical (word) level and at the word combination level (expression, phraseological unit, pemia, etc.). Dysphemisms are considered to be types of tropes that are used for indirect naming. The use of dysphemisms involves the "deterioration" of evaluative conclusions, the replacement of an ordinary (neutral) name with a rude, vulgar, quarrelsome word or expression "in order to humiliate the object of its designation, for emotional reinforcement and emphasis of the statement; sometimes it is a manifestation of linguistic bravado, a desire to shock the listener", which testifies to the use of swear words to describe a person negatively, for example, "regarding a person (snake, mouth, bucket, die, don't bark)" [14, p. 148-149]. Such negatively evaluative lexical units usually in artistic contexts serve as a means of expressing the emotional reactions of characters, manifestations of excessive despair, contempt, anger, etc., verbalized by phraseological units: *Гляди, гадино! – щипив зуби Андрій. – Обманула, обіцялась сказати правду, тягнеш і досі... гляди, тільки подумаєш вийти за Ілька, убію* (Look, you bastard! - Andriy clenched his teeth. - You lied, promised to tell the truth, but you are still dragging... look, if you even think about marrying Ilko, I will kill you) (V. Vynnychenko).

The peculiarity of the phraseological system (in contrast to the lexical system, which covers absolutely all fragments of the environment known to man) is that it mainly characterizes and reflects a person in all the most diverse roles and images [18, p. 49-50]. Phraseologisms figuratively designate those areas of reality that are directly related to the life activity of a person, to his vision and evaluation of realities, fragments of the environment, himself, as well as to the physical and emotional-psychological features of the subject of speech.

The integration of phraseological units in the composition of the phraseological field "emotional world of man" is traced, and it is evident that through the prism of heterogeneous linguistic and cultural information, it reflects the axiological potential of the

names of extra-linguistic realities, the specificity of the phraseological verbalization of the material and spiritual life of the ethnic group, emotional behavioral stereotypes. The phraseological field "emotional world of a person" only occasionally represents neutral emotional states (feelings): 1) calmness: calm the heart ("cause a good mood, calmness in someone; please someone, calm down"); with a light heart, with a light soul ("a state of calm, light joy"); easy on the soul (on the heart) (*Навіть сонце світить так лобю, немов приязно усміхається їй на вітання. У Софії так легко, так весело на душі* (Even the sun shines so kindly, as if it smiles kindly to greet her. Sofya is so easy, so cheerful on the soul... (Lesya Ukrainka); *Чого воно лобю так стає на душі, легко на серці, як побачиш з-під снігу зелену травичку?* (Why is it so nice on the soul, easy on the heart, when you see green grass from under the snow?) (Panas Myrnyi); 2) indifference: *душа заросла полином* (the soul is overgrown with wormwood) ("someone became indifferent, became insensitive, impervious to anything"); *крізь зуби щідити* ("to sip through one's teeth - to speak reluctantly, indifferently, indistinctly, barely opening mouth" (*Хай біжить! – байдуже, крізь зуби щідить Карпо і тихо йде собі до соломотряса* (Let him run! - indifferently, Karpo gnashes his teeth and quietly goes to the straw shaker) (V. Vynnychenko).

At the same time, we record the diversity of two other segments of the phraseological field "emotional world of a person", which represents polar (positive/negative) emotional worlds. Positive emotional states are explained by phraseological units that convey joy. Features of the expression, course, nature of the emotion are reflected in lexical synonymous series that combine specific emotions: *радіти, радуватися, тішитися, торжествувати, тріумфувати* (rejoice, triumph, etc.). Phraseological verbalization of the emotion of joy is multidimensional, filled with various shades, tones and has its own gradation: to be happy (to have a positive, good, cheerful mood; to feel satisfaction, pleasure, comfort from something; to be cheerful, friendly, energetic; to be in a good mood, etc.). The most active representative of the emotion of *радість* (joy) is the lexeme *серце* (heart), which designates the organ that first feels joy, and the lexeme from the sacred sphere of the soul. The somatism *серце* (heart) in the phraseo-semantic field "the emotional world of a person" appears in several guises: as an independent agent (*[аж] душа (серце) радіє (радується), душа тішиться, заграло серце* ([even] the soul (heart) rejoices, the soul rejoices, the heart danced)) (FSUM, p. 34, 277, 281); as a space or container (*на душі / на серці гарно, розодинилося на серці / на душі, легко на душі / на серці* (beautiful in the soul / in the heart, fun in the heart / in the soul, light in the soul / in the heart) (FSUM, p. 170, 418, 747); as a tool of action (*розквітати душею / серцем* - bloom with the soul / heart) (FSUM, p. 751). The feeling of joy is often associated with the singing: *душа / серце співає* (the soul is singing), with joy - *в душі тішиться* (to rejoice in the soul) (FSUM, p. 281): *Вірна дружина буде біля його ходити, своїм тихим словом туго його розганяти, ясними очима серце веселити...* (A faithful wife will walk by his side, dispel his longing with her quiet words, cheer up the heart with clear eyes...) (Panas Myrnyi); *В її [Емми]лиці було щось благородне, витончене, міцне, а усмішка разом з тим така мила, що на душі ставало і легко, і бадьоро, і навіть туман здавався дійсно як в цікавій казці* (There was something noble, refined, strong in her [Emma's] face, and at the same time, her smile was so sweet that it made my soul light and cheerful, and even the fog really seemed like in an interesting fairy tale) (V. Vynnychenko).

The emotion of an elevated mood is represented by lexemes that realize the semantic plans of mental upliftment, inspiration, etc. The components of phraseological units manifest the elevation of physical and creative forces, the activation of all mental processes and are in close relationships with the component of the soul (suffocated state), with the state of the soul: *з дорогою (радою) душею* (with a dear (happy) soul); *за милу душу* (for a sweet soul); *з відкритою душею* (with an open mind); *з відкритим серцем* (with an open heart); *розквітнути душею*

(Як же він зрадив, як **розквітнув душею**, коли... почувся схвилюваний голос: – Егей, земляче, та й ти тут? (to blossom with the soul (How he rejoiced, how he blossomed with the soul, when... an excited voice was heard: – Aegean, fellow countryman, and you are here too? – Yu. Zbanatsky)); *душа поривається, душа вгору росте* (the soul rushes, the soul rises upwards), etc. The last two phraseological units emphasize dynamic processes, human efforts to break away from the everyday (the earth), move vertically, upwards, all the way to the sky, which traditionally symbolizes heaven, the realm of happiness, pleasure and goodness. Such idioms convey the elements of the religious worldview characteristic of Ukrainians: – Та як у їх воюють, коли б тільки ви знали! Як зачне розказувати мій побро [побратим], то аж душа вгору росте (– But how they fight, if only you knew! As soon as my brother starts telling stories, the soul rises up) (P. Kulish) (FSUM, p. 277).

The positive evaluative emotion of admiration combines external and internal manifestations of positive emotional states in the consciousness of Ukrainians: *Заграло серце (душа)* (The heart (soul) was touched) – someone felt satisfaction, joy, elation, etc.; *На душі (на серці) гарно* – Як стрінуся з просвіченим [освіченим] чоловіком, то в мене аж **душа радіє**. – Оббився я од села... – почав говорити Леонід Семенович (It feels good in my heart – When I am with an enlightened [educated] man, my soul rejoices. – I fought back from the village... – Leonid Semenovych began to speak) (I. Nechuy-Levytskyi) began to speak; *Надворі лютує зима-лихоманка, / А в мене у хаті щебече веснянка, / Аж **серце радіє*** (The winter-fever is raging outside, / And in my house a freckle is chirping, / Even my heart rejoices) (L. Hlibov); *Ой як вона заспівала, – село розлягає... Ой як вона засміється, **душа радується*** (Oh, how she sings, the village spreads out... Oh, how she laughs, the soul rejoices) (Folk song).

The emotion of admiration is traced in artistic contexts that contain phraseological units with opposite usual evaluative conclusions. In particular, the evaluative potential of the phraseological unit *бісові його ковінька* (“damn it”) depends entirely on the context, it can be used to express admiration, manifestations of positiveness for any reason: [Марко:] *От я й був парубком повного калібру, **бісові його ковінька**. Ге, та що там згадувати!* ([Marko:] So I was a full-fledged scumbag, damn it. Gee, what is there to remember!) (Z. Moroz); – *Ех, **матері його ковінька!** – весело пронеслось у Миколіній голові. – Я вам покажу, як українці танцюють! – і піймавши такт, стукнув, ударив ногою і наче силою якоюсь понісся в танці* (– Eh, his mother's dog! – cheerfully flashed through Mykola's head. – I will show you how Ukrainians dance! – and catching the beat, he knocked, kicked and, as if by some force, carried himself into the dance) (V. Vynnychenko).

The emotion of satisfaction is mostly modeled by polysemous phraseological units, the evaluative semantics of which is based not only on antonymy (they are examples of the representation of positive (“satisfaction”) and negative (“dissatisfaction”) feelings, but also on the contextual detailing of realized semantic plans that combine emotions like “pleasure” and “delight”: 1) *чорт (біс) [його (вас, тебе і т. ін.)] бери (забирай) / візьми (побери, забери і т. ін.)* (devil [him (you, etc.)] / take (take, etc.)). 1. Joke. It is used to express pleasure, admiration for someone, something: [Бугров:] *Я живий! **Чорт забирай**, як я здорово біє!* (I. Микитенко); – *Сев, а хороше море, **чорт його забери?** – Коли б тільки його не малювали синьою фарбою і красивими епітетами* ([Bugrov:] I am alive! Damn, I ran great! (I. Mykytenko); – *Сев, what about the good sea, damn it, take it away? – As long as it was not painted with blue paint and beautiful epithets* (Yu. Yanovskyi). They express contextual positive-evaluative semantic plans with the phrase lexemes *здорово* and *хороше* (healthy and good), realizing the usual positive dimensions.

The emotional-sensual state of love is verbalized by a multi-meaning lexeme, which is qualified in the “Glossary of the Ukrainian Language” on the basis of four lexical-semantic

variants (separate meanings): 1) “a feeling of deep heartfelt affection for a person of the opposite sex; love”; 2) “a feeling of deep heartfelt attachment to someone, something”; 3) to have an interest, a desire for something; 4) need certain conditions as the most favorable for existence and growth (about plants, animals, etc.) (SUM, Vol. 4, p. 563–564). The attribute of love is traditionally the emotion of happiness (1), a number of somatisms that represent this high feeling in all its manifestations (2), the names of denotations of the heavenly sphere (3), for example: 1. *Вдавала, що не бачить нічого й не розуміє нічого, а в душі тішилася молодим щастям* (She pretended not to see anything and understand nothing, but in her soul she was happy with young happiness) (H. Khotkevich); 2. *Здавалось, очі її [Галі] не дивились, а горіли й світилися, щоким палали й некли своїм полум'ям, груди хвилювали під тонкою білою сукнею* (It seemed that her [Hala] eyes were not looking, but burned and glowed, her cheeks burned with their flames, her breasts waved under a thin white dress) (V. Vynnychenko); 3. *Оленько, кохана моя. Та я радий для тебе сонце прихилити* (Olenko, my love. But I am glad to bend the sun for you) (M. Zarudny); *Гірко було Маланці. От, зростила дитину, берегла, доглядала, рада була неба їй прихилити та зорями вкрити, а тепер оддай між люди на поневір'яння* (It was bitter for Malanka. After all, she raised the child, took care of it, looked after it, was happy to bow the sky for it and cover it with stars, and now give it to wander among people (M. Kotsyubynskyi) (to bow to the sky (the sun, the world, etc.) for somebody with words happy, able, etc. means “to do everything for someone, even the impossible”).

Positively evaluative emotions *respect*, *desire*, *inspiration*, *regret* (*sympathy*), etc. are also indicative of the Ukrainian phraseological picture of the world, their differentiation is clearly traced in artistic contexts, where they provide an intra-portrait characterization of the characters.

Phraseologicalization of negative emotional states is provided by phrase components that represent: 1) (*дух*: *упасти духом, занепадати духом* – “longing”, “pity”; *дух у п'яти тікає (лізе, заходить)* “fear”, *важким духом дихати* – “to be angry”: *Як піймав мене [постоялець] в лабеті, як придавив, то в мене й дух у п'яти заліз* (As he [the resident] grabbed me by the labia, as he pressed me, the spirit went down in my labia) (Panas Myrnyi), *А він на тих сусідочок важким духом дише: бодай їх слід запов!* (And he breathes on those neighbors with a heavy spirit: if only their trace was gone!) (Marko Vovchok); 2) a series of somatisms (*упадати серцем, опускати вуха, повісити носа, опускати руки (крила), руки опускаються, повісити голову* (heart falling, ears down, nose hanging down, hands (wings) down, hands down, head hanging down, etc.): *Як же побачив [Шрам], що Сомка немає, то й голову повісив* (As soon as [Shram] saw that Somko was gone, he hung his head (P. Kulish); *І кривавиться серце, читаючи повість вашу, гуцули, ... повість боротьби вашої* (And my heart bleeds, reading your story, Hutsuls, ... the story of your struggle) (H. Khotkevich); 3) names of supernatural beings, for example: devil, demon, evil force, Satan, etc. They embody evil and have the unpleasant appearance of “a dark-skinned person with goat legs, a tail and horns; evil spirit, unclear force, demon, devil, Satan” (SUM, 11, p. 362). Phrases with the following components are used to express a range of negative emotions (dissatisfaction, indignation, annoyance about something): – *Дванадцять років відбачив. Дванадцять з дванадцяти! І круглий рік? **Чорт візьми**, це ж каторга!* (I wasted twelve years. Twelve out of twelve! And all year round? Damn, this is hard labor!) (Oles Honchar); [*Сагайдак (зриваючи п'явки):*] *Десять років не був у вас. Тоді чи не було їх, чи не помічав. **Бісові личини...*** [Quaydak (picking off leeches):] (I haven't visit you for ten years. Then either they weren't there or I didn't notice. Devil larvae...) (L. Dmyterko); – *Та, іди-бо, **бісова личинко!** Бандите клятий!* (Well, go away, devilish larva! Bloody bandit!) (M. Khvylovyy); *А не взяв би лихий оті рекомендації та поради, які ні до чого доброго не привели* (Wicked would take such a situation; And the evil one would take recommendations and advice that did not lead to anything good) (From the newspaper). Let us compare it with the opposite

(positively evaluative) connotations that verbalize the mentioned usual swearing phraseology used in artistic contexts for the purpose of humorous description of the situation, to express satisfaction, admiration for someone, something, etc.: – *Люблю й я смажене сало. Держиш його на вогні, а воно, лиха личина, шкварчить, та на паляницю тільки кап, кап* (I also love fried lard . You hold it on the fire, and it, an evil face, crackles, and on the fire only a drop, a drop) (Ostap Vyshnya); – *Марто... – Ще не забувся, як мене звали? – дивується дівчина. – Ну й бісова ти личина, – похитує головою* (– Marta... – Haven't you forgotten my name yet? – the girl is surprised. – Well, you are a devil's face, – shakes his head) (M. Stelmakh); – *Ой, добра ж оця настоечка, взяв би її лихий!* (I. Нечуй-Левицький); – *Такий розумник, не взяв би його лихий* (Oh, this tincture is good, a villain would take it! (I. Netchuy-Levytskyi); – Such a smart person, the evil one would not take him) (From the magazine).

Negative emotions (feelings) – anger, sorrow/sadness, heartache, shame/shyness, fear, anxiety/excitement, disgust, resentment/contempt, suffering, doubt, anger, restlessness, worry, nervousness, despair, impatience, dissatisfaction, etc. – are verbalized by phraseological units, the component composition of which contains dynamic metaphors with the connotation of “downward movement”, “longing”, “pity”, “claim”, “grieving”, etc.

Bipolar (ambivalent, uncertain) emotional states include surprise, impression, and pride. These psychologically charged segments of the world of emotions of Ukrainians and their phraseological ethnically marked representatives can become the object of further linguistic stylistic studies.

4 Conclusion

The study of the component composition of the phraseological units of the Ukrainian language to denote the world of emotions, the identification of the evaluation potential of the constituents of the phrase based on the materials of the “Phraseological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language”, “Glossary of the Ukrainian Language” and artistic contexts provides grounds for the following conclusions.

The dominant formants representing spiritual and psychological values, the emotional world of Ukrainians are the component composition of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language to denote emotional states and reactions. Emotive phraseology, the distinctive feature of which is the reflection of assessments of various “formants of culture”, starting from emotional reactions to everyday stereotypes, continuing with the social positions of representatives of the ethnic group and ending with beliefs, customs, rites, magical formulas, etc., reflect the national worldview, its axiological potential, determined by evaluative nature of phraseological semantics.

The processes of euphemization and dysphemization function as two opposite trends in language and speech, aimed at improving, mitigating, reducing the negative impact and increasing, expressing it with the purpose of emotional impact on the consciousness of native speakers. Euphemistic phraseological turns are united by the main functional principle - to soften the harshness and categoricalness of statements, to replace negative axiological semantic plans with neutral or positive ones. The processes of dysphemization are based on the special use of stylistically marked (reduced, taboo vocabulary) to express negative evaluations and emotional conclusions about the marked denotation, to emphasize undesirable features in order to achieve a certain communicative goal.

The component composition of phraseological units that verbalize the emotional world of a person includes names of sacred and heavenly spheres, names of parts of the human body (somatism), dynamic metaphors with correlates of “upward movement” (positive connotation), “downward movement” (negative connotation), etc.

The most common in dictionaries and artistic discourse are phraseological units representing negative emotions (feelings): anger, grief/sadness, heartache, shame/shyness, fear, anxiety/excitement, disgust, insult/contempt, suffering, doubt, anger, restlessness, anxiety, nervousness, despair, impatience, dissatisfaction, etc.

The specifics of the evaluation potential of the component composition of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language to indicate the world of emotions consists in the reflection of the value orientations of the ethnos, associated with traditions and rituals, knowledge about the inner world of a person, an intergenerational translational base of life experience and cultural heritage, a form of sociologization, a regulator of behavioral norms of an individual. National-cultural connotations were reflected in the component composition of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language to denote the world of emotions, in the processes of forming bipolar (bivalent, undefined) axiological semantic plans of phrases to denote emotional states, which include *surprise, impression and pride*.

Literature:

1. Artemenko, H. (2012). Illogicality of phraseology and language game: relationship of concepts. Scholarly notes of the Tavri National University named after V. I. Vernadskyi. Philology series. Social communications. *Chernivtsi National University named after Yu. Fedkovych*, Vol. 25(64), 2 (1), 280-285.
2. Baran, Ya. A. (1980). *Basic questions of general and German phraseology*. Lviv: Naukova dumka.
3. Bilonozhenko, V. M., & Hnatyuk, I. S. (1989). *Functioning and lexicographic development of Ukrainian phraseological units*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
4. Bilonozhenko, V. M. et al. (1993). Phraseological vocabulary of Ukrainian language: in 2 books. Kiev: Naukova dumka (FSUM).
5. Boyko, N. I. (2009). Verbalization of the world of emotions in the Ukrainian language: semantic aspect. *Ukrainian Linguistics*: 2009. Issue 39. P. 26-34.
6. Boyko, N. I., & Kotkova, L. I. (2017). *Expressive potential of Volodymyr Vinnichenko's idiolect: lexical and phraseological components: monograph*. Nizhyn: Publication of the NSU named after M. Gogol.
7. Glossary of Ukrainian language: in 11 volumes. Institute of Education Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1970–1980 (SUM).
8. Mileva, I. V. (2005). Euphemism and dysphemism in phrase-making speeches immediately in Ukraine: author. dis. for the sake of science. [pdf dissertation]. Luhansk NPU im. T. Shevchenko.
9. Savchenko, L. V. (2013). *Phenomenon of ethnocodes of spiritual culture in the phraseology of Ukrainian language: etymological and ethnolinguistic aspects*. Simferopol: Dolya.
10. Selivanova, O. O. (1999). *Current trends in modern linguistics (analytical review)*. Kiev: Phytosocial Center.
11. Selivanova, O. O. (2004). *Description of Ukrainian phraseology*. Kiev, Cherkasi: Brama.
12. Selivanova, O. O. (2006). *Modern linguistics: terminological encyclopedia*. Poltava: Dovkillya-K.
13. Skripnik, L. G. (1973). *Phraseology of Ukrainian language*. Kiev: Naukova Dumka.
14. Ukrainian language: Encyclopedia. Kiev: Publishing House “Ukrainian Encyclopedia named after. M. P. Bazhan”.
15. Uzhchenko, V. D., & Uzhchenko, D. V. (2007). *Phraseology of modern Ukrainian language*. Kiev: Knowledge.
16. Vezhbitskaya, A. (2011). *Semantic universals and basic concepts. Language. Semiotics. Culture*. Languages of Slavic Culture.
17. Zhaivoronok, V. V. (2006). *Signs of Ukrainian ethnic culture: reference dictionary*. Kiev: Dovira.
18. Zhaivoronok, V. V. (2007). *Ukrainian ethnolinguistics*. Kiev: Dovira.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AI, AN